

AN *Lay*
ANSWER
TO THE *Theology vol 122.*
DISPUTE
ADJUSTED.

Being

A CONFUTATION of those REASONS
offer'd to prove, that *no Time* is a proper
Time for the Repeal of the CORPORA-
TION and TEST ACTS.

Freely address'd to the AUTHOR.

By a *L*AYMAN. *k*

Thy Heart, insatiable of Rule, wou'd ne'er
Contract its proud Desires, or curb its Swellings:
But thou, curst Man! wou'dst be the guilty Means
To fix our Chains —

Cato to Cæsar.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *J. Roberts* in *Warwick-Lane*, and sold by *T. Cox*
at the *Lamb* under the *Royal-Exchange*. 1732.

[Price Three-Pence.]

ANDREW

DISC
A. J.



Account of the
...
...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...



A N
A N S W E R
T O T H E

Dispute Adjusted, &c.

S I R,



OUR Unacquaintedness with the Interests of Society, or the Foundation of all Law and Government, might have render'd ridiculous any Notice of your Pamphlet; were it not for Numbers of the Thoughtless and Unwary, who will readily swallow down Principles they are prejudiced in favour of; the Preventing of which can alone justify the following Attempt, and remove the Plea of its Non-necessity: For I am persuaded, that the Protestant Dissenters are so far from being in danger of losing their Aim by your Pamphlet, that they are rather oblig'd to acknowledge, you have done them Service among the thinking Part of Mankind, by what you have wrote, to prove that *no Time* is a proper Time for the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts: Since therein you have shewn that the Attempt is exposed to Difficulties from no other Quarter, but from Principles, justly, as well as universally discarded

by all true Protestants ; even from Principles not only fallacious and seditious, but what are also truly subversive of all Social Virtue.

In order to prove that I am so far right, we'll take a more particular and thorough View of your Performance.

You are pleas'd to say in your first Paragraph, " That you beg Leave to make your self so far a Party *in the Affair*, as to offer a few Reasons why you think *no Time at all* is proper."

The first Proposition you lay down, is, " That it will not be deny'd by either of the contending Parties, that those two Acts were design'd for the Security and Support of the Establish'd Constitution in Church and State." To prove this Proposition you say, " The Corporation Act in particular was levell'd wholly against the Dissenters: And though the Test Act had a more immediate Eye to the *Papists*, and the Dissenters insist upon it as *Great Merit* on their Part that they did not oppose it, upon some Encouragement given, *as they pretend*, to be reliev'd from the Penalties of it, one Time or another ; yet when their Case came under a solemn Deliberation in Parliament, immediately after the Revolution, and a Toleration was granted them, the Legislature was so far from *exempting*, that they expressly *included* them in the Disabilities and Penalties of the Test Act."

As to your Proposition ; *By the two contending Parties*, I suppose you mean some of the Members of the Establish'd Church, and the Protestant Dissenters ; of which you say, that these two Sorts of People agree, that these two Acts were design'd for the Security and Support of the Establish'd Constitution in Church and State. And suppose this was Fact, I am as sure the Protestants on both Sides now agree, that the peculiar

peculiar Reasons on which they were at first instituted, are now remov'd ; and that instead of becoming serviceable to the State (if they ever were, which is not granted, and, I presume, cannot be prov'd) they are become an unjust Burthen and Oppression to an useful, loyal, and considerable Body of the Subject, and therefore by consequence ought to be thrown aside, the Reasons being as cogent for the Repeal, as they ever could be for the Enforcing thereof. Besides, To rest upon the Opinion of a Majority, even of the National Representatives, when influenc'd chiefly by a Court of suspicious Principles (as in the Reign of K. Charles the II^d) will determine nothing in the Opinion of an honest Protestant. Nor can that bigotted and unprotestant Way of connecting or herding Parties, be at all accounted for, *viz.* that Protestant Dissenters, the known Abettors and Friends of Liberty, should be chained down with *Papists*, the known Enemies thereof! Would not any indifferent Observer readily ask, What Necessity could there possibly be, for such a free Government, to distress its Friends with its Enemies? Was there any Affinity between their avow'd Principles, or known Practices, that could prejudice the State? Another Question will naturally be put, Are there not others who deserve rather to be rank'd with the *Papists* than they?

But, further, The Dissenters not being reliev'd when their Case came under that solemn Deliberation of Parliament, immediately after the Revolution, I trust, was not owing to any Obligation arising from the Reason of Things, then, or before that Time discovered; any more than it was a Conformity to the express Will and Desire of one of the wisest of Princes, the most renowned Patron of Liberty.

What

What you mean by that Sneer, when you say,
 “ The Dissenters insist upon it as *Great Merit* on
 “ their Part, that they did not oppose the Test Act,
 “ which had a more immediate Eye to the *Papists*,”
 I don’t well know ; except it be, that you wou’d
 silyly insinuate that they are a Parcel of Merit-
 Mongers, and so ought to fare as the *Romanists*
 fare.—However this be, it lies upon you to prove,
 that the Dissenters have not all along preferr’d
 the Peace of Society to their own private In-
 terests.

But you say again, “ They did this upon some
 “ Encouragement given, *as they pretend*, to be re-
 “ liev’d from the Penalties of it, one Time or ano-
 “ ther.” Hereby you wou’d insinuate that the Dis-
 senters wou’d by this impose a Falsehood upon the
 World ; or that the Promises they at several Times
 receiv’d from the Government, by which they
 were animated to such Conduct, were only mere
 Pretences, without any Foundation ; or you can
 mean nothing. To go on :

Page 7. you say, “ In the latter End of Queen
 “ *Anne’s* Reign, an Act was pass’d against Oc-
 “ casional Conformity, by which Dissenters quali-
 “ fy’d for Offices according to the Test Act,
 “ were restrained from going to Conventicles, as
 “ long as they continued in those Offices ; but
 “ this was repealed in the Beginning of the next
 “ Reign, upon these Considerations (as we may
 “ suppose) among others ; That by receiving the
 “ Sacrament according to the Church of *Eng-*
 “ *land*, they did all the Test Act requires ; That
 “ such receiving it was an Evidence, that though
 “ they like their own Way better, they did not
 “ think ours unlawful : Whereas the present At-
 “ tempt to repeal the Corporation or Test Act, is
 “ to let those into Places of Power and Trust, who
 “ think the Service of the Church of *England*
 “ *sinful* ;

“ *sinful*, and who in consequence have not only
 “ a rooted Aversion to it, but think themselves
 “ bound in Conscience to do all that is in their
 “ Power to abolish it.”

• I begin now to suspect that St. *Andrews's* Cryer is
 rose from the Dead, with his Trumpet sound-
 ing the old Tune, *The Church is in Danger!*
 And no wonder we so soon hear, that oppressing
 the Dissenters is the only Way to prevent that
 Danger: But this has all along been the Artifice
 of *Hell* and *Rome*, by inspiring the pretended
 Sons of the Church with Zeal for its Preserva-
 tion; under which Device and Mask they have
 acted over all their Scenes of Villainy: Thus it
 was at that memorable Epocha you mention;
 and had not that glorious Revolution so op-
 portunely ensued in the Accession of K. *George*
 the First, the Oppression of the Dissenters had
 prov'd, in all probability, what it was form'd
 for, *viz.* the Inlet of *Popery* and *public Slavery*.
 And here I wou'd observe, in favour of the
 Protestant Dissenters, that their profess'd and
 inveterate Enemies have always been *Jacobites*,
Papists, and the open Enemies of Liberty: But
 if the Church of *England* can be endanger'd
 from an Enlargement of the Liberties of Man-
 kind, and a more equal Distribution of common
 Justice and Friendship, it does not, I confess,
 to me, appear worth defending.

The notorious Fallacy of your next Position
 deserves to be exploded with due Resentment,
 when you tell us of “ This *Repeal* introducing
 “ Men into Power, who think the Service of the
 “ Church of *England* *sinful*.” One wou'd think
 you imagin'd yourself in *Italy*, where you might
 have Church Authority for what you said, and
 cou'd every where demand an implicit Faith,
 or

or Assent. But don't mistake, all honest Men can and will distinguish better; they know assuredly that the Protestant Dissenters neither believe, or can in Character assert any such thing; but, on the other hand, do esteem the Protestant Members of the Church of *England* as their Fellow Christians; and I dare say, not a Man of common Sense among them, has any Right to the Brat you have begot, and wou'd Father on them. On the contrary, altho' on true Protestant Christian Principles, they dare not own or acknowledge any human Authority over their Consciences in religious Matters; and would call no Man Master upon Earth, or submit to any Impositions, though in things themselves indifferent, or lawful; yet they can, to express a Christian Catholicism, voluntarily join in the most solemn Acts of religious Worship, with the Members of the Church of *England* in its Service; and do firmly believe that its Communion is a truly Christian Communion; and all consistently enough with a Persuasion, that her Principles of Superiority, and Infallibility, which you contend for, and by which the Sacramental Communion in her Usage, and the establish'd Articles of her Faith, are supposed the only Standard of trying the Qualifications of Fellow Subjects and Fellow Christians, for the Services either of civil or religious Society, have no Foundation in the Nature of Things: I say, the Contrary to what you assert is true of them; notwithstanding they humbly apprehend, you have no Authority for Dominion, as Church Christian, from either Christ or his Apostles; but, on the contrary, that these are the very opposite Principles to those on which your Church dissented from the Communion of the Papal Church. And altho' you

you say, "The Dissenters are bound in Conscience
 "to do all that is in their Power to abolish the
 "establish'd Church," it is impossible to prove
 the Truth of this Assertion; since, upon all the
 known genuine Principles, or which the Pro-
 testant Dissenters can possibly support as such,
 it is absolutely impossible they should ever at-
 tempt it. They only desire you would give up
 those Claims which are inconsistent with your
 Character as Protestants, and whenever they at-
 tempt to treat you in a different Manner than
 becomes Protestant Christians, they will then
 deserve to be harass'd and oppress'd; but they
 hope, till then, they may reasonably expect to
 be excused: But with what Front you could
 thus represent them, when their avow'd Prin-
 ciples, confirm'd by long Practice, only prove
 the Reverse, is very surprizing! Have they not
 on all Occasions join'd with the Protestant Par-
 ty of the Church of *England* in every difficult
 Crisis? and have freely and cheerfully done
 their utmost to support the Rights of King
 and People? And these are the Men you would
 render so obnoxious. Pray whose Help was of
 so much Importance to the Church of *England*,
 when in the Jaws of *Popery* in King *James* the
 Second's Time, as the Protestant Dissenters?

As to what has been said about the Impro-
 priety of making the Sacrament a Test in Ci-
 vil Affairs, you have left the Debate between
 the Rt. Rev. *Hoadly* and *Sherlock*; and you
 have done well, since that Side of the Question
 which commands the Approbation of so many
 wise and good Men, must necessarily distress
 your Argument.

After this you expose your Innuendoes, as,

1st, "That it lies upon Dissenters, that object
" singly against this, to find some other Test that
" will effectually keep out both *Papists* and Dis-
" senters." This is so frantick a Remark, that the
Observator's Case is desperate; so that he seems
very much in danger of being put among the
Incurables.

2^{dly}, "The Proposal of receiving the Sacra-
" ment in their own Meetings, as a Civil Test,
" is as liable to Objection as in the Church of
" *England*." This none denies, that I know of,
the religious Action being the same in one
Church as in the other.

3^{dly}, You say, "The main Thing aimed at, is
" to bring it into Question, whether there ought
" to be any Test at all." And pray, Sir, With
what View have you drawn this Conclusion?
Wou'd you intimate by it, that the civil and
religious Interests of the Dissenters are not as im-
portant to them, as the Interests of the Mem-
bers of your Church are to Church-men? They
are Men born with like Capacities with your-
selves; and the Principles in which they are e-
ducated, bid as fair for making them good
Subjects, as those of your particular Church:
And if you mean that they are against such Se-
curities, as the Safety of the State requires, your
Meaning can have no Foundation. I ask you
again, Who have ever made a more unanimous
and hearty Stand against *Popery*, or for the
Defence of Protestant Liberty, and the civil
Properties of a free People? In what Instances
have

have they attempted to expose the State, or involve the Church? Be pleas'd to lay Charges of this Nature nearer home, and let Men of your own Principles bear the Charge.

Your next Paragraph is, "There is one thing observable (say you) in the Test Act, which has not been commonly attended to, though of the same Importance in the present Case: The Dissenters plead, that there was no *Desire* or *Intention* in the Legislature, to include them in the Disabilities and Penalties of that Act." You then ask, "Why besides the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and the Declaration against Transubstantiation (all which are required by that very Act) did the Legislature think fit to require the Sacramental Test, which is the only thing in it that affects the Dissenters?" The Answer of a Dissenter you make to be, "That the Legislature thought they could not effectually exclude the *Papists* without that Test:" And you then draw a like Consequence; on which you put this Question: *viz.* "What then shall exclude the *Papists* if the Sacramental Test be abolished? Not Oaths, or Declarations, — but their Joining with the Church of *England* in the most solemn Act of Christian Worship, is a Bar of the strongest Kind."

To which I answer, That if the Dissenters have so pleaded, that they were not design'd, nor intended to be included in the Disabilities and Penalties of the Test Act, they are also able to prove, that this was the solemn Acknowledgment, and Profession of their Friends

who sat at Helm; and if they were impos'd on, it cannot be esteemed as a Fault in their Plea. You further say, " It was necessary that " the Sacramental Test should be added, to " exclude the *Papists*." I would here, in the first Place, remark, That although the Legislature might possibly act upon this Principle, or from this Motive; yet it does not hence follow, that either the Motive was rightly consider'd, or the Institution justly founded. For my part, I can see nothing but Absurdity in the Motive, take it in what View you will, that the Friends of the Government, yea, great Numbers of its most faithful Subjects, should be disabled and disqualified, *i. e.* discouraged by a Brand of Infamy put upon them, in order to keep out the profess'd Enemies of a Protestant Community: Nor can the Judgment of the Legislature be sufficient alone to make the Matter of any Law reasonable and fit. The Nature of Things is unalterable; and to this universal Law of Nature, all Men, and Things, and Laws themselves ought to submit, and by this, their Turpitude or Fitness is to be try'd: Thus, says *Osborne*, in the *London Journal*, Numb. 667. " A Law, though made by King, " Lords, and Commons, is no farther right than " as it is conformable to the Law of Reason." But why our Legislature should make such a Law, as should require an Act of religious Worship to be celebrated in a particular Manner and Form; *i. e.* according to the particular Usage of one Denomination of Christians, in order to qualify Men for civil and military Offices, is difficult to account for; since the Nature, Reason,

son, and Fitness of the Thing will not. But my Author has added, " That joining with the Church of *England*, is a Bar of the strongest Kind; Oaths and Declarations are not such good Securities as this: For 'tis an open Acknowledgment, that our Church is a true Church, and our Ministry a true Ministry, and we true Members of the Catholic Church of Christ, notwithstanding our Separation from the Church of *Rome*." Thus it appears that these ecclesiastical Reasons were the Motives to the Legislature. But, methinks, 'tis a thousand Pities, these zealous Sons of the Church had not represented to the Legislature, that the Protestant Dissenters were remov'd a Degree further from the Church of *Rome*, than the Church of *England*; and that consequently a religious Sacramental Test, by communicating among them, would have more effectually excluded the *Papists*, as the Concessions would have been much larger. And they might very gravely have confirmed the Observation, by telling them, that the Zealots of the Establish'd Church have a much greater Opinion of the *Roman* Catholic Communion and Friendship, than of the Protestant Dissenters. And Instances enough would have been ready at hand: And so, *vice versa*, of the *Papists* Veneration for the high-flying Zealots of the *English* Establishment; and that *they* have frequently found their Account in it.

You go on to tell us, " That the Dissenters plead much their natural Rights, and the unjust Invasion of them by these Acts." Upon which you ask " Whether Society and Government itself, is not founded in an A-
" bridgment

“bridgment of natural Rights, in such Instances, and such Degrees, as, in the Judgment of the Legislature, the Safety and Welfare of the Whole require.”

To which I answer, That all Men are by Nature equal, and no Man can have a Right over others till the People give him that Right for their own sakes: So that the People are the true Fountain of all just Power. But the sole End of Government also, is the Preservation of the Rights of Mankind; and whenever any Government neglects to secure these Rights, or in any Degree actually abridges them, so far is that Government from being supported upon a just Foundation, that the very Basis thereof is become insecure and dangerous. And thus stands your Observation, *That Society and Government is founded on an Abridgment of natural Rights*, or, in other Words, *Upon an unnatural Foundation*. The Instance you produce to prove your Proposition, is naturally enough built upon your Principles, but is no more to be justified or defended than the Proposition itself; for although only Men of Estates are to represent the Nation, as you say they ought to be, in order to secure the Landed Interest; yet does this prove, that the mercantile and trading Part of the Nation ought not to be as naturally represented?

Your next Paragraph, Pag. 13, 14, is, “That the Dissenters are against any Church Establishment at all, and look upon all Interpositions of the Civil Power, in favour of a National Religion, as Usurpations on the Rights of Mankind.”——And hence you con-

conclude, they ought to be kept out of all Power, &c.

In Answer to the Whole of your Declamation and Rant through this Passage, I'll make use of an Essay of *Osborne's*, in the *London Journal*, Numb. 694. as speaking the Sense of the Protestant Dissenters, and is a most pertinent Reply to your Argument.

“ A National Church (says he) there may
 “ be, and I think ought to be; for the People ignorant, and diffus'd as Sheep without
 “ a Shepherd, require a publick Leading:
 “ But then this Church should, as Church-Christian, require nothing to be believ'd, but
 “ what is absolutely agreed by all Christians
 “ to be of Divine Authority: And the Matter
 “ and Forms of Worship should be as general as possible, to receive all and keep
 “ out none. But the Civil Power should annex
 “ no Rewards to those who come into this Church, nor inflict any Penalties or
 “ negative Discouragements on those who think
 “ themselves obliged in Conscience to keep
 “ out: The Church should be only *persuasive*,
 “ not *compulsive*.

“ 'Tis the Magistrates Duty, indeed, upon
 “ setting up a *National Church*, to take Care
 “ that it be supplied with *wise* and *good* Teachers; to *pay* those well who do *their Duty*
 “ well, and to *turn out* those who do not; because 'tis the *Nation's Church*, the Care of
 “ which must necessarily be committed to those
 “ who are intrusted with the *Care of the Nation*.

“ This National Church being constituted by
 “ the *Civil Power*, must be *absolutely subject* to,
 “ and

“ and *dependent* on *that Power*. A Church is
 “ not (as some Church-Men imagine and arro-
 “ gantly affirm) an essential Part of the Con-
 “ stitution, because constituted by the Civil
 “ Power ; for should the Civil Power ever
 “ think it proper to change any *Articles, Creeds,*
 “ or *Forms* of Worship, now establish’d, the
 “ Constitution would be the same. We have
 “ not (as some Men affect to talk) two Con-
 “ stitutions, an *Ecclesiastical* Constitution, and a
 “ *Civil* Constitution ; which is perfect Nonsense,
 “ unless the *Ecclesiastical Power* be *independent*
 “ on the *Civil Power* : No, our Constitution is
 “ but *One*, and that is a *Civil* Constitution ;
 “ which has establish’d a Church called *the*
 “ *Church of England* : But this Church is not an
 “ essential Part of the Constitution ; for nothing
 “ is essential to the Constitution, but what if left
 “ out, the Constitution would be *destroyed*.—The
 “ State or Constitution remains the *same*, though
 “ the Laws relating to *Church* or *State* be
 “ *changed*.

“ The Magistrate’s Power of *compelling* by
 “ *Force*, or with Penalties, can relate only to
 “ the *Security* of Person and Property : That
 “ his Power in *Religious Matters* can differ only
 “ in Degree from the Power of any other Man ;
 “ nor can it be any thing else but a Power of
 “ *informing the Judgment*, and persuading to the
 “ Practice of Virtue : That in order to this good
 “ End, the Civil Power may constitute a Church,
 “ appoint Teachers, and settle a Maintenance ;
 “ but that every Subject should be left at full
 “ Liberty to *conform* or *not conform* to this
 “ Church ; and that *all Dissenters* should be put
 “ upon

“ upon an equal Foot, with regard to all *Civil*
 “ *Affairs* as the Church-men.

“ This is the Way, and the only Way to
 “ Truth and Peace ; nor could any *Inconveni-*
 “ *encies* follow from this just Liberty : For where
 “ all Religious Sects are *equally regarded* by the
 “ Civil Power, they will be *equally obedient*.
 “ 'Tis the Power given to one to *oppress* the o-
 “ ther, hath occasioned all the *Disturbances* that
 “ ever were in the World about Religion.”

The Occasion of inserting so large a Quotation is, because it so pertinently exposes your Ignorance or Wickedness, respecting the Principles of Government ; and may serve to shew the Fallacy of your whole Scheme. But I proceed.

Page 15. you say, “ It might be expected that
 “ the Dissenters should strengthen their Argu-
 “ ment of Natural Right, by Instances fetch'd
 “ from other Countries.” You might have
 added, Wherein general Bigotry, Superstition,
 and the exorbitant Claims of the Clergy prevail :
 From hence we are to strengthen the Argument
 of Natural Right ; whereas in most Things
 wherein our Constitution tallies with theirs, in
 those very Respects are found all the Imperfecti-
 ons and Mistakes that attend it, or are inter-
 woven in its Frame.

Your Advice, Page 15, 16. is somewhat ex-
 traordinary, viz. “ That they should wait till
 “ they have wrought the Body of the Nation
 “ into a Belief, that there ought to be no Church
 “ establish'd ; and till they have convinc'd the
 “ Crown, that an Episcopal Church is not so well
 “ adapted to the Support of Monarchy, as the
 “ Presbyterian and Independent Model ; or that
 “ the Services which the Bishops and Clergy,
 C “ and

“ and Friends of the Establish’d Church can
 “ perform to the Crown, are not considerable
 “ enough to be put into the Balance against
 “ those he may expect from Dissenters, and their
 “ Well-Wishers; or, that there are not suffi-
 “ cient Numbers qualify’d to serve the Govern-
 “ ment, that are willing to comply with every
 “ Legal Requirement. ” I Answer,

These also are unnecessary Difficulties thrown
 in the Way of the Protestant Dissenters: Which
 will hereafter appear. As,

First, They must convince the Crown, that an
 Episcopal Church (which is no other than a
 Creature of the State, and absolutely dependent
 on it) is not so well adapted to the Support of
 the Government, as the Dissenting Models. But
 why so furious? The Monarch needs not be con-
 vinced that Government must be supported, either
 on Episcopacy or Presbytery. He is already con-
 vinced that they owe their Preservation, and pecu-
 liar Dignities to the Civil Power; as is evident in
 both *South* and *North Britain*.

Your second Difficulty which respects the
 Services of the Bishops and Clergy, and the
 Friends of the Established Church, as set in Op-
 position to the Protestant Dissenters and their
 Friends, is as unnecessary as the others: For al-
 though the Protestant Dissenters have great Rea-
 son to venerate and esteem many of the present
 Bishops and Clergy, yet a little Acquaintance
 with our *English* History will convince any im-
 partial Reader, that the more our *British* Kings
 have been directed and influenc’d by the Clergy,
 the more has the Glory of their several Reigns
 been eclips’d; for, the less the true Weal of the
 Subject

Subject has been promoted. We have not yet forgot that famous Sermon at *Westminster*, in which the State was made to depend on the Church; but what Reception it met with from that August Audiences is so notorious a Refutation of the Doctrine among *Britons*, that we must conclude we are at present in no Danger from that Quarter.

But to proceed, Why must the Bishops and Clergy, and their Friends, be set in Opposition to Protestant Dissenters and their Friends? It is indisputably true, that the latter are the known Friends of the present Government; but if Bishops and Clergy must stand in Opposition, his Majesty King *George* (whom God long preserve) can easily discern who of them has the first Right to his Favour. If you dislike the Conclusion, thank yourself for it.

But again, Are the Protestant Dissenters, whose Number at the lowest Calculation is much above 700,000; and whose Wealth in Land, &c. amounts to near 15 Millions: Are these to be discarded the Favour and equal Protection of the Legislature, as an inconsiderable Part of the Community?

As to your third Difficulty, It appears altogether without Foundation, and therefore I leave it to the Mercy of the next Puff of Wind.

Your last extraordinary Remark is, " That without the Spirit of Prophecy you foretel, that whenever the Church shall break in upon the Toleration, or the Toleration upon the Church, the Peace of this Country is at an End. "

It has been already shewn that the Church is only a Creature of the State. By Church, here,

I would be understood the Church Establishment, and which I take to be your Sense; for otherwise you speak altogether at Random. For if by the Church you should mean the Church of CHRIST, or Church Christian, or the Church of *England*, is only a Part of it, and all the several Denominations of Protestant Dissenters are as truly Church Christian, as those of the Establishment: But this latter Interpretation will not do for you at all; because, as Church Christian and Protestant, it has no Power or Authority at all to prescribe either Articles of Faith to other Christian Societies, or Tests of Qualification for Members of Civil Society. But why, as an establish'd Church, it has Power to break in upon the Toleration, I don't understand. The State or Legislature are the true Executors of Power, and can, no doubt, at Pleasure alter or repeal such Laws as appear to be incompatible with the Welfare of the whole Community: But what is this to the Church's breaking in upon the Toleration, or the Toleration upon the Church? It cannot be deny'd but the Church did instrumentally break in upon the Toleration, in the Reign of Queen *Anne*; but at the same time it does not appear, that the injur'd Party made any seditious Attempts to break the Peace of the State. But I shall here take Leave to propose some Articles of Advice to the Protestant Dissenters, sum up your Arguments, and draw a few Conclusions.

Adv. 1. If it were true that my Author spoke the Sense of the Church, as he pretends; and (which is of more Importance to you,) the Sense of the Crown, or State; you might be
assur'd

assur'd from his own Mouth that *no Time* is proper. But don't be discouraged, he is so given to Lying, I would not have you believe him.

Adv. 2. Though the Matter of your Petition is your acknowledged Right, publickly own'd as such, by King, Queen, Lords, and Gentlemen of the first Rank among us, yet apply with Modesty and all due Humility, as becomes dutiful Subjects.

Adv. 3. Whatever you do, be unanimous; *i. e.* whether you apply, or forbear, let none divide you. Your Unanimity will not only please all the Friends of Liberty, but is that which only can secure your Success, or render you of any Importance.

Adv. 4. Act in Character; *i. e.* don't be ungrateful for the Indulgence of the present Government, that has not suffer'd you to lie open to Prosecutions from malevolent Churchmen, for not subscribing to the thirty six and a half Articles; and beg with all Earnestness, that the same tender Father, of you his People, together with the Lords and Commons, would put it out of the Hands of any persecuting Prelate to disturb your Peace, who may at any time have threatened it.

Adv. 5. Let your Temper and Conduct recommend you to the whole Community of your Fellow-Subjects, although you should be neglected by them; and doubt not but your Cause which is eminently that of Liberty, and Loyalty,

Loyalty, *will one* Day or another be regarded.

I shall sum up my Author's Arguments, and draw Conclusions.

The Adjuster confidently asserts, that the Protestant Dissenters esteem the Communion of the Church of *England* sinful; and are hereupon oblig'd in Conscience to use their utmost Power to abolish it. That the Legislature by one of these disabling Acts, principally intended the *Papists*, but that the Protestant Dissenters must necessarily be included, because the Sacrament, according to the Usage of the Church of *England*, is the only public Security. That Government is founded on an Abridgment of natural Rights, and therefore the Liberty of the Dissenters *may lawfully be sacrificed for the Sake of the Church*. That the Establish'd Church is Part of the Civil Constitution; and that the State is dependent upon it. That doing Justice to the whole Community, will shake the Foundation of the Church, and consequently destroy the Peace and Welfare of the State. From whence I'll draw some *Conclusions*.

Con. 1. Although my Author's first Charge is a notorious Falshood, yet it is well calculated to spread the Wild-fire of Party Zeal, and enlarge Unchristian Divisions.

Con. 2. From his so warmly abetting the Principles of Persecution, under the Cover and Sanction of Law, is discovered considerable Skill in gilding over the former Bolus.

Con.

Con. 3. In order to support his Scheme, he advances Principles about Civil Government, which would poison the Fountain of Power itself, and render eternally insecure the only Bulwark of Property.

Con. 4. He has interwoven the Interests of the Church with the State, and made them mutually dependent ; hereby reviving that pernicious and false Doctrine, which has ever been the Plea of Traitors, and the Cry of the most perfidious Sons of the Church.

Con. 5. Without the Spirit of Prophecy we may conclude, That, in all probability, the Author is some ambitious Prelate, who would fain exercise an exorbitant Dominion, not only over Persons and Properties of a Civil Nature, but also over Consciences: From whose Jurisdiction and Influence, *Good Lord deliver us !*

F I N I S.



5 2 3

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
SUBJECT: [Illegible]



FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
[Illegible text]

2 1 W 1 1



